

[8th December 1954]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That Rule 24 of the Assembly Rules be suspended and the House do resolve to transact Government Business on Thursday, the 9th December 1954.’

I think the party leaders have come to the agreed conclusion that we shall transact Government business to-morrow.”

The motion was put and carried.

[IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS DRAMATIC PERFORMANCES BILL, 1954—*cont.*

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, I moved the motion for the reference of this Bill to the Select Committee yesterday because the leaders of various parties wanted that the Bill required scrutiny and as such, should be referred to a Select Committee. In accordance with their suggestion, I moved the motion for the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee. But now suddenly there has been a change in the attitude of the leaders. They as a matter of fact agreed to give the names of members for inclusion in the Select Committee by to-day. But I do not know what has happened since then? The Communist Party and the Dravidian Party are not willing to join the Select Committee. (An hon. Member: ‘ Even the Praja Socialist Party.’) That only shows the attitude which the Opposition members are taking in respect of this Bill. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was stating that he was very much interested in the art of drama. I do not know when he developed this attitude to dramatic art and culture.”

* SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—“ On a point of order, Sir. Is the Hon. Minister entitled to say that he did know when the hon. Leader of the Opposition had developed a liking for dramatic art and thereby cast an insinuation on the hon. Leader of the Opposition and thereby imply that the hon. Leader of the Opposition had developed a liking for art and culture only recently? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is not an insinuation against the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. the Leader of the House has expressed only his personal opinion.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Apart from what you have said, Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition much better than his own party men. Therefore, let not the hon. Member, Sri T. C. Narayanan Nambiar, take any objection to what I had said. I referred to it because of the attitude taken by the Leader of the Opposition towards the performances of dramas, pantomimes and dramatists and persons engaged in that profession. He wants to make political capital out of a certain situation. After agreeing to give the names of his party men to serve in the Select Committee, he has now withdrawn his stand. He now says that his party has decided not to serve on the Select Committee.

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

With the great regard and respect which I always have for the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I wish he should have some consistency. Having agreed to the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee and having also agreed that he would give the names of two members from his party for serving in the Select Committee (he said this yesterday evening), he now says that his party has decided not to serve on the Select Committee. I could understand the hon. Leader of the Opposition saying that his party would not join the Select Committee if *after* listening to my speech, he had come to that conclusion. But I had not replied yesterday. I have begun to reply only *now*. But even before I began my reply, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated that his party will not join the Select Committee. The attitude he took yesterday has changed overnight. That is the real difficulty with which I am faced now. Had I known yesterday that the Opposition would take this sort of attitude, I would have taken my own decision whether to refer the Bill to a Select Committee or not. I would have taken my own independent decision without consulting the party leaders. The hon. Leader of the Opposition not only agreed to join the Select Committee yesterday but even said that he would give the names of two members of his party, who would join the Select Committee, by yesterday evening. After that, they said that they would give the names to-day morning. But now I find a change of attitude on their part. They have not listened to my reply *yet*. Had they listened to my speech and then changed their attitude of joining the Select Committee, I could see some reason in it. The hon. Leader of the Opposition might say: 'Well, we have listened to the reply of the Leader of the House. We are not satisfied with it. So we are not prepared to join the Select Committee'. But even before listening to me, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has changed his mind because, I think, he wants to make political capital out of the situation. As far as I am concerned, I am really placed in a false position because I have made my colleagues understand that I had discussed with party leaders and on their agreement, I was moving the motion for the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee. Of course, political parties are entitled to make political capital out of any situation. But the facts should be known not only to our party members and other party members but to the public also. They should know how the Opposition is changing their attitude with a political motive, after having entered into a gentleman's agreement that they would join the Select Committee. Therefore, I am entitled to argue and place the matter before one and all and show how the Opposition are not the real promoters of art and drama as they claim but that they want only to make political capital out of the situation to suit their own ends. I want all to remember that the Communist Party, whatever might happen to others, would exploit any situation to their own advantage. Therefore, I want to inform the 12-10
other party members not to get into a mess by joining hands with P.m.
the Communist Party because when they find that it is not to their own advantage, they would drop them like hot potatoes at any time and at any situation as they have dropped me now. Having agreed

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

to a decision, they should not have gone back upon it. I feel I have been let down to a certain extent and I am certainly entitled to complain about the attitude taken by them. Only the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is here—the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has gone away on a more important job because he thinks that he has got more important business than attending the proceedings of this House—and I hope he will have to say something on this matter before I proceed further.”

*** SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—**“ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நேற்று தோழர் ராமமூர்த்தியும் சரி, நானும் சரி விவாதம் இரண்டு நாட்கள் நடைபெறவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டிருந்தோம். சர்க்காரே அந்த மசோதாவை ஒரு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விடவேண்டுமென்று பிரேரேபித்திருப்பதை நாங்கள் எதிர்க்க முடியாது. ஏற்றுக் கொண்டோம். என்னுடன் கூட இருந்த சில அங்கத்தினர்களும், நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ சுயம்பிரகாசம் அவர்களும் அதை ஒப்புக்கொண்டார். அவர்களே அந்த மசோதாவைப் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்பவேண்டுமென்று பிரேரேபித்ததின் காரணமாக நாங்கள் அதை எதிர்க்கவில்லையே தவிர அதை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விட நாங்கள் சம்மதித்தோம் என்று சொல்வது சரியல்ல.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Did not the hon. Member agree to give the names yesterday evening? ”

*** SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—**“ “அந்த பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு யார் யார் பெயர்களைக் கொடுக்கிறீர்கள் ?” என்று கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் கேட்டார்கள். “ அதை இப்பொழுது கொடுக்க முடியாது, காலையில் கொடுக்கிறோம் ” என்று தான் சொன்னோம். செலக்ட் கமிட்டிக்கு சம்மதித்து சர்க்காருடன் இணங்கி ஒத்துழைப்பதா இல்லையா என்பதை நாங்கள் அப்போது முடிவு செய்யாததின் காரணமாகத்தான் அப்படிச் சொன்னோமே தவிர, செலக்ட் கமிட்டிக்கு நாங்கள் இணங்கி எங்கள் கட்சி அங்கத்தினர்களின் பெயர்களை நாளைக்குக் கொடுக்கிறோம் என்று சொன்னதாக கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் நினைத்துக் கொண்டிருப்பார்களேயானால் அதற்கு நாங்கள் பொறுப்பாளி அல்ல.”

*** THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—**“ It was not as if the hon. Member was not prepared to give the names of his party members. He wanted to give the list at the time of my reply. Since the reply to the debate was postponed, he said he would give it this morning. As a matter of fact, the names were also discussed and it was suggested that the hon. Members Sri M. Kalyanasundram and Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar should be in the Committee. Later on, they said that they would consider the matter further and give names. I wish we are a bit accurate in respect of the statements that we make. If the hon. Member is going back upon the agreement, there is nothing preventing him from doing so. It is merely a gentleman's agreement. But still I want to make it clear to hon. Members what had happened and how they have gone back upon the agreement reached yesterday.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I take it that the hon. Member Sri Kalyanasundram was not agreeable that the report of the Select Committee should be submitted on or before the 13th December.”

*** SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—**“ If the Hon. the Finance Minister feels that we are going back on our word, he is free to have that opinion. After consulting the other members of the party and

8th December 1954] [Sri M. Kalyanasundram]

the leaders of other parties, we decided that no useful purpose will be served by our joining such a Select Committee. That is why, Sir, we have come to this decision. With regard to the other points raised by the Hon. the Finance Minister, it is true we had some formal consultations but even then, it was said that the question of our giving the names will be considered this morning. When I said that, what I was having in my mind was that no useful purpose would be served."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I never understood that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the leaders of the other parties had their own mental reservation when they said that they would give the names of members to-day. I am not concerned with it and I am not at all surprised over that. Now, I shall proceed to answer some of the points that have been raised.

" Simply because I am meeting some of the points which have been raised on the floor of the House, hon. Members need not be under the impression that I have made up my mind on the subject. I have agreed that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. As some matters have been raised and as those matters have been put forward as revealing the attitude which the Government have taken for the purpose of meeting a certain situation, it has become necessary for me to answer some of the points. Hon. Members need not be under the impression that because I am meeting those points, I have a closed mind in the matter and that I will not be prepared to consider any suggestions which may be made in the Select Committee for improving the Bill. With this preface I shall proceed.

" The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday that this Bill aimed at stifling dramatic art and that the Government wanted to throw in the streets thousands of dramatists and others engaged in this profession. I may tell the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who is present here that we are much more concerned with the development of dramatic art than they. We are much more concerned with the improvement of the status of the artists who are engaged in this very noble and ancient art. I may assure everybody concerned that the suggestion made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that this is an attempt by the Government to stifle dramatic art is, if I may say so, nothing but fantastic, and I may give this assurance on the floor of this House that we will do everything possible for the healthy development of this dramatic art so that it may serve the very useful purpose of educating the public and providing entertainment to them. At the same time, persons who are engaged in this noble art will also be sufficiently protected. Their interests will be looked after and they will be given recognition.

" The hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to an incident with reference to the dramatic festival, that is with reference to the selection of dramas for the dramatic festival which is now being held in Delhi. He wanted to insinuate and he wanted to suggest to those who are engaged in this profession that we wanted

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

to neglect the dramatists and those who are engaged in that profession and that was why the festival took place without reference to them. Sir, it has, therefore, become necessary for me to inform this hon. House as to what actually happened with reference to this matter. This dramatic festival is being conducted by the Government of India and the Central Sangeet Natak Academy is responsible for this. They wanted that competitions should be held in the various parts of the country in various language dramas and that a selection should be made of the best of the dramas and the list should be sent to Delhi for the purpose of their making a final selection. In this connection there is an organization known as the Theatre Centre of India. This organization has not come into existence only for the time-being but it has been there for a sufficiently long time. I do, however, know that a branch of this Theatre Centre came into existence only very recently so far as Madras is concerned and many members who belong to this profession and who are also members of the Nataka Kazhakam are members of the Theatre Centre."

SRI M. PALANIYANDI :—"On a point of information, Sir, அந்தக் கமிட்டியில் நாடகக் கலையையே தொழிலாகக் கொண்டிருப்பவர்களும்கூட இருப்பதாக கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அதிலிருக்கக்கூடியவர்கள் எல்லாம் வெறும் அமைச்சுக்கள்தான் என்பதை கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் அறியமாட்டார்களா ?"

12-20
p.m.

*** THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—**"I do not know whether Sri T. K. Shanmugam belongs to that profession but I know definitely that he is a member of that. Apart from that I know the members of that organization. I also know the members who belong to the Nataka Kazhakam. It is not as if I am unaware of them. I move with them and I know all of them. Leaving aside all those things, the Theatre Centre has taken up the responsibility at that level. The branch of that Theatre Centre wanted to be in charge of the festival. Even then, I suggested that it will not be good for the Theatre Centre to take it up, and that the Regional Sangeetha Nataka Academy is a representative organization sponsored by the Government which should conduct it. But since at the Central level it was decided that the Theatre Centre should organize this competition at the various centres wherever its branches functioned, as a compromise, I agreed that the Regional Centres should make the selection and send it on to the Central organization. That was the formula arrived at. Later on, there was a committee meeting. Leave alone the Theatre Centre. It was not as if the Theatre Centre was left completely in charge of it. I knew that that arrangement would create difficulties. That was why I suggested that there might be a separate committee. The Governor was elected the Chairman and I the Vice-Chairman of that Committee. There were also some other members on the Committee. It was a representative Committee, if I may say so. To that Committee we co-opted some actors who were members of the Nataka Kazhakam also. In its first meeting or even in the subsequent meeting, it was not made known to us that there was

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

any objection to constitute that Committee for the purpose of conducting the competition and that the responsibility should be handed over to the Nataka Kazhagam. If an objection had been raised even at that stage, I would certainly have considered it. I am not mentioning this for the first time. I mentioned this soon after the controversy arose. If an objection had been raised then, I would certainly have considered it and it would not have been very difficult for us to hand over the entire responsibility to the Nataka Kazhagam. After all, if the Kazhagam was prepared to conduct the entire show, why should anybody else interfere with it? Therefore, in that context, we constituted a Committee with the Governor as its Chairman. Having constituted it and having asked it to function for a specific purpose, we could not go back from the position we had already taken and hand over the entire responsibility to the Nataka Kazhagam. In these circumstances, I want to assure hon. Members, all those persons who belong to the dramatic profession, and all those who belong to the Nataka Kazhagam that it was far from the mind of myself or anybody in the Government or even anybody connected with that Committee to slight the Nataka Kazhagam. We very well know the great service that is being rendered to this noble art by the Nataka Kazhagam. Therefore, it was not our intention to slight this Nataka Kazhagam at all. But in view of the development of the circumstances at that time, we could not go back from the position we had already taken and hand over the responsibility to the Nataka Kazhagam. That was the real position. Therefore, I hope and trust that this incident would be forgotten and that it would not be taken advantage of by political parties to suggest that the Government are taking an attitude whereby they want to slight all the artistes who are engaged in this dramatic profession and that they do not want to take notice of the Nataka Kazhagam of Madras at all. As a matter of fact, we have always considered the Nataka Kazhagam as representing the dramatic artistes and whenever representations have been made on behalf of that organization, as far as I am concerned, I have given them due consideration. I do not think that that will be denied by any member or any office-bearer of the Nataka Kazhagam. I have always given due consideration to their representations and I have met their points of view also in respect of many matters. Therefore, this incident should not be taken advantage of by anybody for the purpose of fomenting trouble between the Government and the dramatic artistes. I hope this explanation will be accepted by everybody—not only by those belonging to the Nataka Kazhagam but by the Members sitting here also—and I trust that nobody will try to utilize this situation for creating trouble not only for the Government but also for the Nataka Kazhagam. We have to work together if we want to promote this art. If anyone is interested in the promotion of this art, he should know that his object cannot be achieved by encouraging a sort of factious spirit within the Kazhagam or outside the Kazhagam, between the Kazhagam and the Government. The Government also have to take into consideration the persons who are actually engaged in this profession, for the purpose of the promotion of this art.”

[8th December 1954]

* SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :—“ On a point of order, Sir, குறிப்பாக நாடகக் கழகத்திற்கும், சர்க்கார் கலையை வளர்ப்பதற்காக எடுத்துக்கொள்ளப்படும் முயற்சிக்கும் இடையே சில தகராறுகள் இருந்து கொண்டிருப்பதாக கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் கூறினார்கள். நாடகக் கழகத்தைப் பொறுத்தவரையிலே எனக்கும் அவர்களுக்கும் நெருங்கிய தொடர்பு உண்டு.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ எனக்கும் அதற்குமேல் நெருங்கிய தொடர்புண்டு.”

SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :—“ உங்களுக்கு நெருங்கிய தொடர்பு இருக்கலாம். அதனால்தான் இச்சபையின் முன்பு இம்மாதிரியான ஒரு மசோதாவைக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறீர்கள். அது தான் அவர்களுக்கும் உங்களுக்குமுள்ள நெருங்கிய தொடர்பு. இந்த மசோதாவைப் பார்க்கின்றபோது நாடகக் கழகத்திற்கும், கலைக்கும் அது எவ்வளவு மதிப்பு கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பது நன்றாகத் தெரியும். நாடகக் கலைஞர்களிடத்திலிருந்தும் தென்னிந்திய நடிகர் சங்கத்திலிருந்தும், நாடகக் கழகத்திலிருந்தும் கலைஞர்களை வரவேற்கும் குழுவில் ஒரு பிரதிநிதியைக்கூட நியமிக்கவில்லை என்பது சர்க்காருக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும். * அப்படியென்றால் அவர்களைக் கலைஞர்களின் பிரதிநிதிகளாக சர்க்கார் கருதவில்லையா? இந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் மற்றொன்றைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகின்றேன். சில மாதங்களுக்கு முன்பு சோவியத் ரஷ்யாவிலிருந்து ஒரு கலாசாரக் குழுவினர் இங்கு வந்திருந்தனர். அதற்காக சர்க்கார் அமைத்த வரவேற்புக் கமிட்டியிலும் நாடகக் கலைஞர்களுக்கு பிரதிநிதித்துவம் அளிக்கப்படவில்லை. இப்போது வந்திருக்கக்கூடிய சீன காலாசாரக் குழுவினரை வரவேற்பதிலும் இவர்களை வரவேற்புக் கமிட்டியில் சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளவில்லை. இதைப்போன்று தியேட்டர்ஸ் சென்டர் பொறுக்கியெடுத்ததிலும் இவர்களுக்கு இடமில்லை. அப்படியென்றால் சர்க்காரின் அபிப்பிராயம்தான் என்னவென்று கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன். கலைஞர்களிடத்திலே இந்தப் பொறுப்பை கொடுத்து, அவர்களோடு சர்க்காரும் இணைந்து கலையை வளர்ப்பதை விட்டுவிட்டு, கனம் நிதி மந்திரியார் அவர்கள் இந்தச் சபையில் அதற்கு மாறாக விவாதிப்பது அவ்வளவு சரியல்ல என்று தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ How far it is a point of order is indicated by your silence, Sir. (Laughter.)

“ I was coming to the other aspect concerning the visit of the Soviet Cultural Delegation and the impending visit of the Chinese Cultural Delegation. We are taking every step to see that the artistes coming from the various countries get an opportunity to mingle with the artistes of our country so that they may see and appreciate our art. But that is quite a different thing from making arrangements for their reception and their comfortable stay here. That is purely a function of the Government. It is at the Governmental level that this Delegation has been invited. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Government to provide them with all the conveniences. It is not as if we are slighting the artistes in any way. On the other hand, this Committee is making every arrangement to see that every opportunity is provided for our artistes to mingle with the artistes coming from the various countries and to show them their own talents so that they may go back with a better appreciation of our artistes and art. But certain sections of the people who are not real artistes but who are persons wanting to take political advantage of the situation are, of course, a little bit chagrined about it. But we are not going

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

to give them such an opportunity. They may try to mislead the people by saying that artistes have been neglected. But it will not hold water here. Nobody will be allowed to take political advantage of cultural delegations. Cultural delegation will be purely a cultural delegation. Politics will not be allowed to get into it. If steps are taken for that purpose, I know the hon. Members Sri Jeevanandam, Sri Ramamurthi and Sri Kalyanasundram will be aggrieved. But I am not concerned with what they think about it. I have to do my duty as one belonging to this State and to this Union. We have laid down a code with regard to cultural delegations and we have to observe it. I want to give an assurance on the floor of this House that it is not the intention of the Government to neglect any section of artistes whether they belong to the Nataka Kazhagam or any other organization. On the other hand, we are now taking every step possible at the Central level and the State level to encourage artistes and to give them sufficient inducement so that they may work for the promotion of this art. Therefore this is also another attempt to politically exploit the situation."

* **SRI P. JEEVANANDAM** :—"On a point of order, Sir, சீன டெலி 12 30
கேஷன் வரப்போகிறது. அதை வரவேற்பதற்கு சர்க்கார்த்தரப்பில் ஒரு p.m.
வரவேற்புக்கமிட்டியை அமைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். 'கட்சி சார்பற்ற முறையில்தான் அவர்களுக்கு எல்லா வசதிகளையும் செய்து கொடுப்பதற்காக நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கலைஞர்கள் உட்பட சர்க்கார்த்தரப்பிலிருந்து இந்த வரவேற்பைத் திறமையாகச் செய்யத் தகுந்த வரவேற்புக்கமிட்டியை அமைத்திருக்கிறோம்' என்று நிதி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் கூறினார்கள். அந்தக் கமிட்டி முழுவதையும் எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் எல்லாக் கட்சிகளையும் சேர்ந்த கலைஞர்கள் அதில் இருக்கிறார்களா என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். சனம் நிதி அமைச்சர் கூறுவது மாதிரி காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியில் மாதிரம் சிறந்த கலைஞர்களை, அல்லது நிதி அமைச்சர் யாரைக் கலைஞர்கள் என்று ஒப்புக் கொள்கிறார்களோ அதற்குத்தகுந்தமாதிரி அவர்களை சேர்த்துவிட்டு, சிறந்த தொரு கமிட்டியை அமைத்துவிட்டேன் என்று சொல்வது சபையை mislead பண்ணுவதாகும் என்று கூற விரும்புகிறேன். கலைஞர்கள் எல்லாக் கட்சிகளிலும் இருக்கிறார்கள். கட்சிசார்பற்ற அந்தக் கமிட்டியில் சிறந்த கலைஞர்கள் இருக்கிறார்களா என்று கேட்கிறேன்? தயவு செய்து கமிட்டியின் அங்கத்தினர்கள் யார் யார் என்று படிக்கும்படி கேட்டுக்கொள்கின்றேன். சீன டெலிகேஷனை வரவேற்பதற்குப் போட்டிருக்கும் கமிட்டியிலுள்ள நபர்களைப்பார்த்தால் கலைக்கும் அந்தக் கமிட்டியிலுள்ளவர்களுக்கும் ஆகாயத்திற்கும் பாதாளத்திற்கும் எவ்வளவு தூரம் இருக்குமோ அவ்வளவு தூரம் இருக்கும்."

* **THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM** :—"I agree that the Reception Committee does not consist of artistes. The members of the Reception Committee are not going to give any performance or entertainment. It is purely a hospitality committee constituted for the purpose of properly looking after visitors. This job must be left to that committee. None of the members of this Committee are going to participate in any of the dramatic performances, or dance or music recitals. So the absence of artistes in this committee is nothing surprising. It is for the purpose of avoiding politics, we have not included in the committee any politician. We thought that those who are not politicians will be in a better position to participate in the deliberations of the Committee which as

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

I said already has been formed to look after the visitors. Naturally, the hon. Member Sri Jeevanandam has a grievance and I am prepared to face that grievance."

* **SRI P. JEEVANANDAM** :—" எனக்கு மனதிற்குள்ளே grievance கிடையாது. கம்ப்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சிக்கும் இதில் grievance கிடையாது. காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் அத்தனைபேரும் அந்தக் கமிட்டியில் இருக்கிறார்கள். கமிட்டியைப்பார்த்தால் தெரியும். கலைஞர்கள் உண்மையிலேயே வருத்தம் தெரிவிக்கிறார்கள். இன்னும் வருத்தத்தொடு இருக்கிறார்கள். நடிகர் சங்கம், நாடகக் கழகங்கள் யாவும் அந்தக் கமிட்டியைக் குறைவாக மதிக்கிறார்கள். வரவேற்புக்கமிட்டியில் கலைஞர்களுக்கு இடம் கொடுத்தால் தான் அந்நாட்டு கலைஞர்களுடன் இந்நாட்டுக் கலைஞர்கள் நெருங்கிப் பழகுவதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைக்கும். இப்பொழுது நியமிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் கமிட்டியால் கலைஞர்களுக்கு அவர்களுடன் பழகுவதற்கு போதிய சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைக்காதென்றும், அந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்தை அரசியலார் கொடுக்கவில்லையென்றும் கலைஞர்கள் கருதுகிறார்கள்."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I will be able to satisfy them. I will look after them and it is my job. The hon. Member Sri Jeevanandam need not teach me how to deal with them."

* **SRI S. RAMALINGAM** :—" 'சின டெலிகேஷனுடைய குறைகளைக் கவனித்துக் கொள்வதற்கு எங்களுக்குத் தெரியும்; நாங்கள் கவனித்துக் கொள்கிறோம்' என்று கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். சபை அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கு நம் நாட்டு நடிகர்களுடைய குறைகளைப்பற்றி எடுத்துச் சொல்வதற்கு உரிமை உண்டா இல்லையா என்பதைத் தங்களிடமிருந்து அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்."

MR. SPEAKER :—" மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்னதை நீங்கள் சரியாகப் புரிந்துகொள்ளவில்லையென்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். சின டெலிகேஷனுடைய குறைகளை சர்க்கார் கவனித்துக்கொள்வார்கள் என்று மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்னார். நீங்களும் அவர்களைக் கவனித்துக்கொள்வதாயிருந்தால் கவனித்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள்."

* **SRI S. RAMALINGAM** :—" வருகிறவர்களுடைய குறைகளைப் பற்றி ஸ்ரீ ஜீவானந்தம் சொல்லவில்லை. வரவேற்புக்கமிட்டியில் தமிழ் நாட்டிலிருக்கக்கூடிய கலைஞர்கள் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ளப்படவில்லை என்று அவர்கள் குறைக்கூறுகிறார்கள்; ஆகையால், அவர்களைச் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று சொன்னார்கள். அப்படி எடுத்துச் சொல்வதற்கு எங்களுக்கும் உரிமை உண்டு என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I am not in the habit of repeating what another man has said. Still, I am tempted to repeat the proverb which was quoted here, viz., 'ஆடு நனைகிறதே என்று ஓநாய் குந்தி அழுகிறது."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, I would like to know whether the discussion that is going on has any reference to the Bill on the anvil."

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" The Hon. Minister has given a very interesting proverb. May I know the meaning of it? "

* **THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM** :—" Sir, even with regard to the reception to the Soviet Cultural Delegation or the Chinese Cultural Delegation, it is not our intention to slight any of the artistes or any of the associations of artistes. Our intention is

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

to see that it is purely a cultural delegation and is not exploited for any political purpose. If we take any step in that direction, it should not be taken by anybody that we are trying to neglect anybody and that we do not have regard for them. Apart from that, now that the question has been brought to the forefront, they want to attribute an attitude of indifference on our part to many artistes. It is said that for this purpose only, viz., to neglect the artistes, this Bill has been brought forward. Anyway, that is the charge which the hon. Leader of the Opposition attempted to make. I may assure hon. Members that it is not our attitude. We are very much concerned with the artistes and also raising their status. We are also interested in the promotion of art as such. That is why I wish to assure this honourable House even at the outset that it is not our intention to neglect the artistes. It is not for that purpose that we have brought forward this Bill.

“ Sir, several arguments have been adduced saying : ‘ There is the Act of 1876. Why don’t you retain it? If you want to amend it suitably and if you want to provide for appeal, you can do that by retaining that Act itself and amending it suitably. It will be much better to have that Act than bring forward the present Bill.’ I knew that such an attitude would be taken. With great respect to the hon. Members on the other side of the House, I appeal to them to scrutinise this Bill from a lawyer’s point of view and find out whether we have liberalised the provisions already existing or have placed greater restrictions. On the face of it, it may of course appear that with reference to ‘ objectionable performances ’ the 1876 Act contains only three sub-clauses whereas the present Bill that is before the House contains seven clauses. If we take the number of the clauses, it may be argued that there are four more restrictions in the present Bill than in the original Act. With great respect to the hon. Members on the other side, I wish to point out to them that under the 1876 Act anything can be brought under it. Any performance can be prohibited. I will explain the position a little further so that hon. Members may be able to understand the real position. We do not want some of its clauses to stand as they are. For instance, the old Act included performances of a ‘ scandalous and defamatory nature.’ If it was defamatory even against one individual, it was enough and the Government can prohibit the performance. Then, anything can be considered as ‘ scandalous ’ by the Government. Such a sweeping provision was found in the old Act. But, still it is argued that the old Act with such a provision was much better. I am unable to understand how it is better. Again, there is another most obnoxious provision in the old Act which we did not like and against which we ourselves had fought in the past. By using this provision, many of the dramas to which reference was made by Sri Jeevanandam, were prohibited in the past. This is the provision, Sir; ‘ likely to excite feelings of disaffection against the Government established by law.’ No violence need be involved, no offence need be involved. If it is likely to promote feelings of disaffection against the Government, it will be enough to prohibit any performance. Such being the

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

case, can the hon. Members seriously say that the old Act was much better than the Bill that is now under consideration? We have removed those clauses from the present Bill. The Government is to-day running on a party system. We belong to a certain party and the Opposition members belong to certain other parties. As far as we are concerned, we are prepared to face any charge, let it be in a drama, cinema or a platform. We know we are liable to be opposed and we are bound to be opposed. We have not retained those provisions in the old Act under which anything can be prohibited. Hon. Members, I suppose, know that our own High Court has held that bringing into disrepute a police constable, is seditious. If an attempt is made to bring a police constable into disrepute in any performance, the Government can very well prohibit it because, under the old Act it amounts to exciting feelings of disaffection against the Government inasmuch as the police constable is a very important limb of the Government. Do the hon. Members want this provision to stand? I want to ask, 'Are they serious when they say that the old Act is much better?' I am sure the present Bill will not operate against the dramatic art. I respectfully submit that if only hon. Members take care to go through the provisions of the existing Act and the Bill that is before the House, they will really understand what an improvement the present Bill is on the old Act. We have liberalised the provisions as far as objectionable dramatic and other performances are concerned."

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" But the changes now made are much wider, Sir."

12-40
p.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The words used in the old Act are 'likely to deprave and corrupt persons present at the performance.' Sir, anything can be said to deprave the mind of the people, anything can be said to corrupt the mind of the people. I can bring in anything under the Act of 1876 and say I am entitled to prohibit it. When I scrutinised the old Act I said: 'No, this should not be allowed to stand. It should be replaced by some other more reasonable Act.' Hon. Members said: 'When the other States have not amended the old Act why should this Government alone amend this Act and bring in a new Act.' 'Why don't you also continue the old Act as they do.' When I scrutinised the provisions of the present law, I thought, that we had to revise it. Then the question arose as to which should be made objectionable and which should not be made objectionable. This is a matter altogether different from saying that the present Act need not be revised. I am therefore unable to agree with them that we should retain the present Act amending it only to the extent necessary, namely, providing for appeal. If only we wanted more power we could have retained the present Act itself. If we want to ban dramas conducted by any political party like the Communist party or any other party, the present Act would be more than enough. I could have satisfied people saying that the Government are not touching the provisions of the present Act but only providing for appeal. But

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Government do not want to do that. I say the provisions in the present law are obnoxious and we wanted to change them. Instead of saying: 'Let us look into the definitions of 'objectionable matter' and other matters and see whether changes are necessary in those definitions', to say that: 'No, no, Government should have amended the present Act only providing for appeal and not bringing in a fresh Bill', is, I should respectfully suggest, not doing justice in any event. It is no good opposing anything just for the sake of opposition. When anything is brought before the House it is easy to suggest that the other thing would be much better than the proposition actually before the House. That is why I advisedly used the words, 'if the Bill is scrutinised from a lawyer's point of view'. I know the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would pun upon the word 'lawyer' because I happened to be a lawyer.' I may say, Sir, even lawyers can be good men and non-lawyers bad men. But that is a different matter altogether. But, as far as I am concerned, I have absolutely no doubt that the provisions of the present Act should not be allowed to stand as they are, any longer. We have to amend them. That is the attempt that we are making by bringing in this Bill.

"Let me now refer to the various provisions contained in the Bill itself. Let us see whether we can take objection to anything contained in the Bill. In sub-clause (i) of clause 2 we have used the words 'incite or encourage any person to resort to violence or sabotage'. It is not merely disaffection, saying this man is not behaving properly, this Minister is not behaving properly and all that. This has been removed in the present Bill as far as the Government are concerned. If violence or sabotage is preached through the performance of a drama, we say it is objectionable and nobody can take objection to it. No one who wants to be law-abiding, who wants that democratic methods of changing the Government should be established, would object to it. Also, Sir, I do not think that any person who wants to have orderly Government in this country and in this State, any person who wants to have democratic principles established here in this country and in the State, and any person who says that the votes of the people and the ballot box shall decide the fate of the Government and who is wedded to that principle, will object to the provisions in this Bill regarding the preaching of violence and sabotage.

"Then, Sir, in sub-clause (ii) of clause 2 we say: 'incite or encourage any person to commit murder, sabotage or any offence involving violence; or'. This is not with reference to the Government, but society as a whole. In respect of the society as a whole if there should be incitement or encouragement to commit murder, sabotage, and offences involving violence, do hon. Members want that to be preached through the performance? For the purpose of promotion of art, is it necessary to preach violence or encourage people to commit murder, sabotage or offences involving violence?

"Then in sub-clause (iii) we say: 'incite or encourage any person to interfere with the supply and distribution of food or other essential commodities or with essential services'. Sir, it was

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

said : ' Suppose I go and preach to the tenants to ask for more share from the landlords or I go to the labourers and ask them to demand a little more wages from the managers. Then will all these have come under this sub-clause '. Absolutely not. It has nothing to do with these things. That is why we have purposely put ' supply and distribution of food and other essential commodities '. It does not concern with the production stage. During critical times, we had to ration very essential articles. We have to supply drinking water through pipes to about 14 lakhs of people in Madras. Suppose a person incites people saying : ' It is our duty to go and see that these pipes are broken and the supply of water is obstructed ', can we allow such a thing? So also with reference to essential supplies. That is the intention of the Government in having the clause. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to consider any suggestion that might be made with reference to this sub-clause. After all this is not very important. This is a matter which can be considered in the Select Committee. The Select Committee can either change the sub-clause or drop it. Let us first examine the various aspects of this question and if we come to the conclusion that this is unnecessary as far as dramatic performances are concerned I am quite prepared to consider the suggestion. But let us first sit together and consider the matter.

" Then, Sir, sub-clause (iv) says :

' seduce any member of any of the armed forces of the Union or of the police forces from his allegiance or his duty, or prejudice the recruiting of persons to serve in any such force or prejudice the discipline of any such force.'

This has reference to armed forces as far as the entire Union is concerned with reference to foreign countries and the Police service with reference to internal security. We have taken authority only to a certain extent. There are other countries where there is only Police rule and nothing else. That is a different matter. We are not concerned with them now. Even in the most democratic countries, we have to deal with unruly elements and anti-social activities. We have to have a strong and incorruptible police force who will stand loyally. If an attempt is made through a dramatic performance under the guise of promotion of the dramatic art, to foment discontent among them and wean them away from their path of loyalty should that be allowed? Of course it is possible for a party to say : ' No, no. We are a political party and we should be allowed to indulge in all these things '. Unless we all take that attitude, I am sure hon. Members of this House will give their support to the Government in passing such a measure, and agree with me that art should not be prostituted for purposes of fomenting trouble in the armed forces and the police services.

" I will deal with sub-clauses (v) and (vi) at the end. I will take up sub-clause (vii). It says : ' is grossly indecent, or is scurrilous or obscene or intended for blackmail; ' I want to ask hon. Members : ' Should you allow under the guise of dramatic art,

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

blackmailing and should we allow scurrilous or obscene things to be said on the stage. These are there already in the Criminal Procedure Code. Should hon. Members think that opportunities to do these things should be given under the guise of promoting dramatic art, I am not able to agree with them.

“ Regarding sub-clauses (v) and (vi), certain objections were taken to these clauses and it was said that these are a little bit wide and would restrict honest and *bona fide* expression of opinion, with a view to reform society so that the people might become better educated and enabled to realize the truth, so to say. It was said that even these *bona fide* case could be brought under this Act. I agree that these clauses as they stand are a little bit wide. They may have to be circumscribed to a certain extent. But, in this connection, I want to make a distinction between *bona fide* expression of opinion and the other side of it. It has been contended that people are entitled to have freedom to say that they do not believe in religion, and they have freedom to preach atheism. There is perfect and fullest freedom to do all these and say religion is opium to people. But for this purpose is it necessary to slander anybody? The Ramayana might be a mere story. It might be a mere fiction. Whether the Ramayana is a mere story or something else or whether Rama is God or only a mere human being and such other things, in regard to these people are at perfect liberty to propagate their views. To say that Rama is only a human being, is it necessary for that purpose, to slander Sita, Rama or anybody else? Sita and Rama are held in high esteem by a large section of the people of our country. Sita is supposed to be as far as we are concerned—leave aside what the people in the North have said about Rama and Sita and the high esteem in which they are held by people in North India—the model of chastity. Should we slander them for the purpose of merely establishing that they are merely human beings and the Ramayana is a mere story?

“ Therefore, honest criticism is quite different from slander. I was told—of course for hon. Members sitting on the other side of the House it will be very interest to hear it—by a prominent man who happened to visit Soviet Russia that even though they do not believe in God and do not encourage people to believe in God, they do not like slandering God. So, slandering is quite different from honest expression of opinion and propagating it also. If we keep this in mind and if we stick to this formula, I have absolutely no doubt that no law can prevent it. Not only now but even past history shows that different ideologies have been preached. It also shows that even directly contradicting ideologies have been preached and have been accepted by certain sections of the people and opposed by certain other sections of the people. It is not necessary for the purpose of establishing the greatness of God or the greatness of Rama, for the Government to take action and the law to come in for their protection. But the feelings of the people are important. Here it is not as if the greatness of Rama will go down by preaching. If he is a true God and is great, he does not become

12-50
p.m.

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

a lesser God simply because there is a drama or some lecture about 'The Ramayana' defaming Rama. But the question involved here is the feeling of the people. Here is a large section of the people who honestly believe that Rama is something whom we can worship and Sita is something whom we can place before womanhood as an ideal. If that is so, we should not by slandering Rama and Sita, injure their feelings, and that is the only request I want to make to hon. Members. I have absolutely no objection to any propaganda being carried on that 'The Ramayana' is merely a story, it is a fiction and it is an imagination of Kamban even though he was not instigated by any Brahmin to write it. But it is necessary not to hurt human feelings by slandering Rama and Sita, whom they are holding in high esteem. I allow others to hold different opinions and propagate them privately. If we want to have self-respect, we do not get it by slandering our ancestors or by slandering our great literature. Certainly, we are not going to be more respected by that. On the other hand, we are only degrading ourselves. Go to any country, any self-respecting country, wherein there is real freedom. They have a feeling of joy in and a habit of glorifying the past—their ancient literature, etc. Therefore, we also should have due respect and due regard for our ancestors. We may not agree with what is stated there but we should have respect and due regard for our great literature. Unless we develop that attitude, we cannot command real respect. If only we approach this question in this manner, there is absolutely no difficulty about it. Unfortunately, certain people think that opinions can be expressed only by slandering other people and hurting their feelings. By that, we are not going to achieve anything. On the other hand, we would only be hardening the attitude of the other people. Now, I would appeal to the hon. Members and also the public who are so much agitated over this matter to approach it in this attitude. If they do it, I am absolutely certain that there would not be any necessity for any conflict arising between the various sections of the people."

*SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—"On a point of order, Sir, சீதையை கடவுளாக பாவிக்கவில்லை என்று சொல்லுகிறவர்கள் மிகவும் கீழ்த்தரமாக பேசுகிறார்கள் என்று சொல்வது சரியல்ல. இன்னும் கீமாயணம் போய் பார்க்கிறவர்கள் ராமனும் சீதையும் கடவுள்கள் அல்ல என்று சொல்கிறவர்கள்தான். ராமனும் சீதையும் கடவுள்கள் என்று சொல்லுகிறவர்கள் இதைப் பார்ப்பது கிடையாது. அப்படி இருக்கும்போது இதற்கு ஆக்ஷேபணை என்ன இருக்கிறது? ராஜாஜிகூட சொல்கிறார், ராமனை அரசகுமாரன் என்று . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"I think, it is not at all a point of order."

MR. SPEAKER :—"It is not a point of order."

SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—"இது point of order இல்லையா? அப்படினாலு விட்டுடுங்க . . ." (Laughter.)

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Is it just like saying 'After all, nobody is compelled to purchase any paper. Let anybody write any obscene or defamatory thing. Why should we go

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

and read it?' But these are public performances to which anybody is invited to attend. After all, we are only prohibiting certain public performances and not private performances. Anybody can stage dramas and arrange dance parties in private and nobody can prevent them. But if they become public performances, a certain amount of decency and restraint has got to be observed. Here, we are only referring to public performances and not private performances. If the hon. Member Sri Shanmugam thinks that he will be ennobled by seeing such a drama of his choice, it is open to him to invite all the artistes to his house and witness it. He is entitled to do that and to hold his own opinion. I know he wanted to put things in a humorous way and that was why he interrupted me. Therefore, if all these things are taken into consideration, I have absolutely no doubt that nobody will, in any way, be hurt and there would not be any necessity for this controversy. I am prepared to consider any suggestion for the purpose of re-drafting sub-clauses (v) and (vi) of clause 2 of this Bill. Only slandering and the intentional hurting of the feeling of others are taken into consideration and not every dramatic performance wherein some opinion is expressed which may hurt somebody. It was only for that purpose, I agreed to the Bill being referred to the Select Committee so that we might sit together and try to evolve a certain formula for the purpose. If the Hon. Members sitting on the other side say that they would not co-operate, that certainly means something else. It may mean that they do not want to better this Bill but want to gain political advantage over this Bill. This is a different thing altogether and, as far as I am concerned, I am not going to allow any opportunity for them to make political capital out of this.

"Sir, the original Act of 1876 has been there for the past nearly 80 years. Of course, during the British regime, they were taking very severe action against 'sedition'. After Independence, there are not many such cases. In my view, if we want to give publicity to any insignificant thing, we must prohibit it by saying that it should not be seen, and then we see that it gets the greatest publicity. Therefore, I feel that we should not ban a certain thing unless it is absolutely necessary and it becomes essential for the purpose of maintaining law and order and preventing a breach of the peace. It should be allowed and the people will decide themselves what is truth and what is not truth. Even if the performance or literature which is objectionable is seen by the people, they will know the truth ultimately. Therefore, I am not at all concerned, bothered or troubled in my mind with regard to these various dramas and various lectures. But then, Sir, there is the question that these dramas should not lead to breach of peace. It is not as if only one party is involved in this affair. There are others also who are concerned and we will have to see 1 p.m. that 'slandering of anybody' is kept within certain limits. If this is observed, it is not necessary for the Government to come into the picture. When conflicts arise between sections of the people, certainly it is the duty of the Government to see that those

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

conflicts are resolved and that order is maintained for the benefit of those who commit breach of peace and also for the benefit of those who do not commit breach of peace. That is the justification, Sir, for this Bill. I am sure that all right-thinking hon. Members will agree that some regulation is necessary even with regard to public dramatic performances so that conflicts between various sections of the people do not arise. It is only from that point of view that we have brought forward this Bill. I am prepared further to scrutinize the provisions of the Bill to decide what is the absolute minimum control that is necessary for the purpose of meeting this situation and not with a view to stifle art or thrown thousands of people into the streets as they would like to put it for their own purpose. That is not at all the intention of the Government and I am prepared to consider all reasonable suggestions for bettering this Bill.

"With regard to the criticisms levelled against clauses 3, 5 and 6, I wish to submit that these clauses relate to procedural matters. They relate to the action to be taken once a public dramatic performance is found to be objectionable as defined under clause 2. The ultimate authority to decide whether a public dramatic performance is objectionable or not should be an independent judicial body. But subject to that, a certain situation may arise when it may not be possible to refer the matter to a judicial body and when interim action will have to be taken by the Executive authority. For taking such action, there should be provisions embodied in the Bill, and for this purpose minimum provisions have been made in the Bill. I am prepared to consider any suggestion which may be made for the purpose of making any alteration in the procedure which is laid down in clauses 3 to 15.

"I do not know why certain sections of the hon. Members should non-co-operate even before knowing the attitude of the Government. Even now it is not too late. I would appeal to the hon. Members belonging to the various sections of the House who have made up their minds not to co-operate with me even before knowing the attitude of the Government, to change their minds now. After all we are all interested in the healthy promotion of art which would truly serve the purpose of the society as a whole. If that is the purpose hon. Members have in mind, and that is the purpose for which they want to work, I would appeal to them to change their mind even now and co-operate with the Government to see how best the provisions in this Bill can be changed so that every section of the people may be satisfied. People should not think that unnecessary fetters are being imposed on the expression of opinion and that is not our object—I want to assure hon. Members and also the public—as far as this Bill is concerned. Thank you Sir."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—"I would like to explain the position of my Party with regard to the alleged grievance made by the Hon. Minister for Finance. I must agree that there was a tacit

8th December 1954] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

acceptance by us to refer the Bill to a Select Committee when we gave the names of Members of my Party to serve in the Select Committee. A willing tacit acceptance is just as good as a word given and we are not going back on it and we shall not let down any one, let alone the Hon. Minister for Finance. As regards the date by which the Select Committee should submit its report to the Legislative Assembly . . .”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member wants that the date should be changed? ”

* DR. K. B. MENON :—“ There was no formal negotiation or consultation about either referring the Bill to a Select Committee or about the date by which the Select Committee should submit its report to the Assembly. It may not always be possible or convenient to consult all Party Leaders. I accepted the situation and suggested names of Members belonging to my Party to be nominated as Members of the Select Committee.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ What about the date by which the Select Committee should submit its report to the Assembly? ”

* DR. K. B. MENON :—“ When a demand of that kind is made by the Government, my Party will try to accommodate them and I shall leave the fixation of date by negotiation.”

*SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“ கனம் அவைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் பேசிய காலத்தில் ‘கட்சித் தலைவர்கள் எல்லாம் கூட முதலில் இந்த மசோதாவை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்ப ஒத்துக்கொண்டார்கள்; ஆனால் பிறகு அப்படி ஒத்துக் கொள்ளாதது போல கட்சியின் பிரசாரத்தை அடிப்படையாகக்கொண்டு, சொன்ன வாக்கிலிருந்து பின்வாங்கி விட்டார்கள். இப்படி சட்டசபைக்குள் முன்னென்று சொல்லி பின்னென்று சொல்வதும், ஒத்துழையாமைக் கொள்கையை அனுசரிப்பதும் நல்லது அல்ல; என்று’ அவர் சொல்லிவிட்டார். முதலிலே அவருக்கும் அவரது கட்சிக்காரர்களுக்கும் நான் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புவது, ஒத்துழையாமை பயிற்சியில் நாங்கள் என்றைக்கும் ஈடுபட்டதில்லை என்பது தான். ஒத்துழையாமை இயக்கத்தில் அவர்கள் ஈடுபட்டகாலத்தில் கூட நாங்கள் அதில் ஈடுபட்டவர்கள் அல்ல. ஆகவே தான் நாங்கள் செலக்ட் கமிட்டிக்கு முதலிலே ஒத்துக்கொண்டு பின்னால் ஒத்துழைக்க மறுக்கிறோம் என்று அவர்கள் சொல்வதானது முற்றிலும் சரியானது அல்ல என்று சபையினருக்குச் சொல்லிவிட விரும்புகிறேன்.”

“ என்ன நடந்தது என்றால், இந்தச் சட்டமானது மிக மிக முக்கியமானது, ஆகவே அதிக அங்கத்தினர்கள் இதைப்பற்றி பேச விரும்புகிறார்கள், இரண்டு நாட்களாவது இதைப்பற்றி விவாதிக்க நேரம் ஒதுக்க வேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் கேட்டோம். அந்தச் சமயத்தில் அவர்கள் ‘இப்பொழுது ஒரு நாள் போதும். இந்த மசோதாவானது பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்பப்படுவதால் பின்னரும் இதைப்பற்றி விவாதித்துக் கொள்ளலா’ மென்று சொன்னார்கள். நாங்கள் சரி என்று சொல்லி வந்தோம். வேறு எதுவுமே பேசவில்லை. அதைக்கொண்டு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு நாங்கள் ஒத்துக்கொண்டுவிட்டதாகச் சொல்வது சரியல்ல. Silence means consent என்று ஆங்கிலத்திலே சொல்வார்களே, அதைப் போல கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் இதைப் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்பப்போகிறோம் என்று சொன்னபோது அதை எதிர்க்காமலும், ஆதரிக்காமலும் மௌனமாக இருந்ததைக்கொண்டு நாங்கள் அதற்குச் சம்மதித்துவிட்டோம் என்ற குற்றத்தை எங்கள் பேரில் சுமத்தினால் அதை நாங்கள் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளத்தான்வேண்டும்.”

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [8th December 1954]

“கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் பேசியபோது தன்னுடைய முடிவுரைக்கு முன்னரையே எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்கள் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் ஒத்துழைப்பது இல்லையென்று முடிவு செய்தது ரொம்பவும் வருந்தத்தக்கது, அவர்கள் தங்கள் உள்ளத்திலே ஒன்றை வைத்துக்கொண்டு வெளியே ஒப்புக்கு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்குச் சம்மதம் தெரிவித்தது போலப் பேசியது தவறு என்பதாக வெல்லாம் குறிப்பிட்டார். ஆனால் அவரது முகவுரையைக் கேட்டவுடனேயே எங்களுக்கு அவர் தன்னுடைய முடிவுரையில் என்ன சொல்வார் என்பதை உணர முடியும். அத்தோடு அவர் தன்னுடைய முகவுரையிலேயே ஒரு கருத்தைச் சொன்னார்கள். ஆனால் அதே கருத்துக்கு மாறான முறையில் காரணம் சட்டத்தில் காட்டினார்கள். 1876-ம் வருஷச் சட்டத்திலே அப்பீலுக்கு வழியே கிடையாது. ஆகவே அப்பீலுக்கு வழி இருக்கும் முறையில் இந்தச் மசோதாவைக்கொண்டு வருகிறோம் என்று சொன்னார்கள். பிறகு சேலத்திலே ஒரு கேஸ் நடந்தது. அந்தக் கேஸ் ஹைக்கோர்ட்டுக்குப் போனது. அப்பொது சர்க்காரின் சட்ட நிபுணர்களெல்லாம் தங்களுக்கு அந்தக் கேஸ் வெற்றிபெறுது, சட்டத்தில் சில குறைபாடுகள் இருக்கின்றன என்று சொன்னதன் காரணமாக அந்தக் கேஸையே வாபஸ் பெறக்கூடிய நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டுவிட்டது. ஆகவே தான் இந்தச் மசோதாவைக்கொண்டு வருகிறோம் என்றும் சொன்னார்கள். சேலம் கேஸ் என்னவென்றும் சொல்லவில்லை. அந்தக் கேஸ் நடத்துகின்ற காலத்தில் எந்தவகையான சிரமம் உண்மையில் ஏற்பட்டது? சர்க்கார் சட்ட நிபுணர்கள் உண்மையில் என்ன சொன்னார்கள் என்றெல்லாம் சொல்ல வேயில்லை. இதிலிருந்தெல்லாம் அவர் முகவுரையில் சொன்ன காரணம் வேறு, உள்ளத்திலே அவர்கள் கொண்டிருக்கிற காரணம் வேறு என்பது நன்றாக யாருக்கும் தெரியும், அதோடு இவ்வளவு அவசரமாக அவர்கள் இதைக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டிய காரணமும் என்ன என்றுதான் எங்களுக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. அவர்களும் அதைச் சொல்லாமல் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டி அமைத்தாலும் கூட அதை தனது யாதாஸ்தை 1954-ம் வருஷம் டிசம்பர் மாதம் 13-ந்தேதிக்குள் சமர்ப்பிக்கவேண்டுமென்றும் சொல்கிறார்கள். அரசாங்கத்திற்கு எப்பொழுதும் சட்டம் இயற்றக் கூடிய உரிமை இருக்கிறது. அந்த உரிமை இருக்கக்கூடாது என்பது எங்கள் எண்ணமில்லை. ஆனால் அப்படிச் சட்டம் இயற்றிக் கொள்ளுகின்ற காலத்தில் இப்படி அவசரமாக ஏன் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமென்பதே கேள்வி.

“சர்க்கார் இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவர இருக்கிற மசோதாவில் 2-வது ஷரத்தில் 6-வது பிரிவில் ‘outrage the religious feelings of any class of citizens of India by insulting the religion or the religious beliefs of the class’ என்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறதாவது மிகவும் பயங்கரமானதொரு விஷயமாகும். எது மதம், எது மதக்கொள்கை என்பது திட்டவாட்டமாக வரையறை செய்யப்படாதவாறு பல பல ஆண்டுகளாக வாத விவாதங்கள் நடந்து வந்துகொண்டே யிருக்கின்றன. இதில் யாரும் முடிவுகாணவில்லை. முடிவு காணக்கூடிய விஷயமும் அல்ல இது.

“இதற்கு நான் இப்பொழுது இரண்டு உதாரணங்கள் கொடுக்கப்போகிறேன். பலகாலமாக நம் நாட்டிலே நந்தனார் நாடகம் நடக்கப்பட்டு வருகிறது. அதிலே ‘மாடு தின்னும் புலையா, உனக்கு மார்கழித் திருநாளோ?’ என்று ஒரு பாடல் வருகிறது. அதை தற்போது மேடையிலிருந்து ஒருவர் பாடினால் அதனால் மனம் புண்படக்கூடியவர்கள் யார்? அந்தப்பாட்டிற்காக நந்தனார் நாடகத்திற்கே தடை விதிக்கப்படுமா?

“இன்னொரு பாட்டைப் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளலாம்—

‘நட் கல்லை தெய்வமென்று

நாலு புஷ்பம் சாத்தியே,

சுற்றி வந்து முணுமுணுத்து சொல்லும்

மந்திரம் ஏதா, ?

கூட்ட கல்லும் பேசுமோ

நாதன் உள்ளிருக்கையில்,’ என்பது

8th December 1954] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

சிவவாக்கியர் பாடல். இதைப்பாடிக்கொண்டு ஒருவர் நடிக்கிறார் என்றால் அந்த நாடகம் தடை செய்யப்படுமா? இந்தப் பாட்டு பெரிய வேதாந்தக் கருத்துக்கள் புதைந்த பாட்டாகப் பலகாலமாகக் கருதப்பட்டு வந்திருக்கிறது. இன்றைக்கு இந்தப் பாட்டைப் பாடினால் மத உணர்ச்சி உள்ளவர்களின் மனத்தைப் புண்படுத்தக்க வகையில் பாடப்பட்டது என்று ஆகாதா?

“இதெல்லாம் நன்கு யோசித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். இதையெல்லாம் கருதியே தான் இந்த மசோதாவையே நாங்கள் அடிப்படையில் எதிர்க்கிறோம். ஆகவே தான் இந்த மசோதா சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் பொது மக்களின் அபிப்பிராயம் எப்படி இருக்கிறது என்று அறிவதற்கு ‘This bill may be circulated for eliciting public opinion,’ என்று நான் திருத்தம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். அதை விட்டு விட்டு நாங்கள் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் முதலில் இருக்க சம்மதித்தோம், பிறகு கட்சிப் பிரசாரத்திற்காக, ஒத்துழைக்க மறுத்துப் பின்வாங்கி விட்டோம் என்று கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொல்வது மிகத் தவறு. நாங்கள் ஒருபொழுதும் சொன்ன சொல்லைத் தவறியது இல்லை என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ So, the hon. Member wants the date to be changed. We have got only 15 minutes more. I shall allow some time to Leaders of Parties to come to a decision . . . ” 1-10 P.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I shall explain a certain position. The hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam has made out a case against me regarding my introductory speech. But, I wish to tell him that long subsequent to my moving the motion in the House, he agreed to his name being included in the Select Committee. Though he had no objection then, now he does not want that and of course it is open to him to say anything. The hon. Member Sri Kalyanasundram also knows the position. Apart from all those things and leaving all the other technicalities whether he accepted or not, even now I am making an appeal to him to be in the Select Committee and help us to better the Bill, if necessary. It is not good for him to keep out altogether. As far as the date is concerned, if we are not able to finish the work within the date fixed, it is always open to us to move a motion here saying that the time shall be extended. We shall try to do our best.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then, I shall give time to the Leaders of Parties to come to a decision. Can I now adjourn the House? ”

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் கூறிய பதிலைக் கேட்ட பிறகும் எங்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயம் மாறக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் இல்லையென்று முதலிலேயே தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டி இருக்கிறது.

“ கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் மிகத் தந்திரமாகப் பேசலாம். தங்களுடைய காரியத்தை மிக வலுவாக ஆதரித்துப் பேசுவதற்குப் போதுமான ஆதாரங்கள் இல்லை, நியாயம் இல்லை என்ற காரணத்தால் அவர் தன்னுடைய பிரசங்கத்தின் திறமையால் எதிர்க்கட்சியில் இருக்கக் கூடியவர்களைப் பிரித்துவைக்க முயற்சி செய்யும் வகையில் பேசலாம். அதற்காக எவ்வளவு மண்ணேரம் வேண்டுமானாலும் பேசலாம். எங்களில் யாருக்கும் அரசியல் நோக்கத்தைக் கொண்டு இதை எதிர்க்க வேண்டும், எங்கள் கட்சியின் லாபத்தைக் கருதி இதை எதிர்க்க வேண்டும் என்ற சுயநல எண்ணமே கிடையாது. ஆனால் அவர்கள்தான் அந்த சுயநல எண்ணத்தை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டு இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதை யாரும் மறுக்க முடியாது. ஆகவே தான் அதன் அடி

[Sri M. Kalyanasundram]

[8th December 1954]

படைக் கொள்கையையே நாங்கள் எதிர்க்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அதோடு உண்மையிலே இந்தச் சர்க்காருக்கு அந்தச் சட்டத்தை நல்ல முறையில் கொண்டு வரவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணமிருந்து அதற்காக பொறுக்கு கமிட்டியை அமைப்பதாக இருக்கலாமோ என்று எண்ணக்கூட இடமில்லை. ஏனென்றால் செலக்ட் கமிட்டியை அமைக்கலாமென்று 8-ம் தேதி தீர்மானம் செய்துவிட்டு அந்த செலக்ட் கமிட்டி தனது யாதாஸ்தை 1954-ம் ஆண்டிசம்பர் மீ 13-ல் தேதிக்குள் சமர்ப்பிக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் இந்த நான்கு நாட்களுக்குள் அந்த கமிட்டியின் அங்கத்தினர்கள் மசோதாவின் ஷரத்துக்களைப் பரிசீலனை செய்ய எங்கே நேரம் இருக்கிறது? அந்த மசோதாவின் ஷரத்துக்களின் விளைவுகளை சட்ட நிபுணர்களோடு வாதிக்க எங்கே நேரம்? அந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் நேரிடையில் பாதிக்கப்படுகின்ற அந்தத் தொழிலில் ஈடுபட்டிருப்பவர்களின் யோசனைகளையெல்லாம் கேட்க எங்கே நேரம் இருக்கிறது? இப்படி கொஞ்சம்கூட அவகாசம் கொடுக்காமல் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியை சர்க்கார் அமைப்பதானது, நாங்கள் இந்த மசோதாவை அவசரப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு கொண்டுவரவில்லை, பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியை அமைத்தோம், அதில் எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்களும் கூடத்தான் அங்கத்தினர்கள், அவர்கள் எல்லோருடைய ஒத்துழைப்பின் பேரிலேயே, யோசனையின் பேரிலேயே இந்த மசோதாவைக்கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறோம் என்று மக்களிடையே எல்லோர் பேரிலும் பழியைப்போடும் வகையில் பேச இடமிருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதற்காகவே நடிக்கப்படும் நாடகம் இது. எல்லாக் கட்சியையும் சேர்த்து இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக்கொண்டு வந்துவிட வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகச் செய்யப்படுகின்ற ஒரு முயற்சி என்று இதை நினைக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. செலக்ட் கமிட்டி அமைப்பதினால் எந்தவிதமான நன்மையும் அவகாசம் இல்லாத காரணத்தினால் ஏற்படப் போவதில்லையென்பதால் சர்க்கார் யோசனையை நாங்கள் ஏற்க வசதியில்லை என சொல்கிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Does the Hon. Finance Minister want me to put the motion to the vote of the House now? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ That may be done after lunch, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The House will now rise for lunch and meet again at 2-30 p.m.

The House then adjourned.

(After lunch—2-30 p.m.)

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ I am happy to announce to the House that we have arrived at an agreement. I am really happy that the Leaders of the various parties have been good enough to agree to a certain course of action in this matter. The main objection seemed to be the fixing of a time-limit within which the Select Committee was called upon to submit its report. They felt it was hustling things. It is not my intention to proceed with the Bill in a hurry. So, I have agreed to the removal of the time-limit mentioned in the Motion with this understanding that the Select Committee will expedite the consideration of the Bill. Another point was also put forward by the hon. Members opposite that opportunities should be given to the parties concerned to make representations before the Select Committee. I have agreed to this course also. We have fixed, in consultation with the various party leaders, four of the clock on Monday as the time at which the Select Committee will sit for the purpose of hearing witnesses.

8th December 1954] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

The Select Committee will sit in the Committee Room, Fort St. George. The Government attach very great importance to this piece of legislation and are anxious that the Bill should be passed even during the present sitting. Every attempt will, therefore, be made to have this Bill passed in the present sitting itself."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, may I make a submission? While recording evidence of parties interested in the dramatic art, elaborate arrangements should be made to give opportunities to all people to present their case. I suggest that if all people cannot be heard on Monday itself the Committee should sit on the following day and hear witnesses."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" This Bill being connected with dramas, perhaps we will sit even till 12 of the clock in the night or beyond because that is the tradition of the Drama."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall now put the amendments one by one to vote. The question is—

' That the Madras Dramatic Performances Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration this day one year.' "

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Dramatic Performances Bill, 1954, be circulated to elicit public opinion thereon.' "

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" With one observation, Sir, I would like to withdraw my amendment. I have agreed to serve on the Select Committee but that does not mean that I accept the principle underlying this Bill."

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I move—

' That the words " with instructions to the Committee that its report be submitted on or before the 13th December 1954 " be deleted from my motion.' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the words " with instructions to the Committee that its report be submitted on or before the 13th December 1954 " be deleted '."

The amendment was put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, when I moved the motion, I said that I would announce the names of Members of the Select Committee later. The following will be Members of the Select Committee :—

- 1 The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam,
- 2 The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker,
- 3 Sri K. Rajaram,

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [8th December 1954]

- 4 Sri C. Rajam Ramasami,
- 5 Sri M. D. Thyagaraja Pillai,
- 6 Sri K. Aranganathan,
- 7 Sri S. N. Somayajulu,
- 8 Sri Antony Peter,
- 9 Sri P. G. Manickam,
- 10 Sri K. Vinayakam,
- 11 Sri V. Govindaswami Naidu,
- 12 Sri K. M. Seethi Sahib,
- 13 Sri S. Swayamprakasam,
- 14 Sri A. Veloo,
- 15 Sri S. S. Kolkebail,
- 16 Sri M. Kalyanasundram, and
- 17 Sri T. C. Narayanan Nambiar."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Leader of the House will make a motion for raising the number of Members to 17."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—" Sir, I would like to make it clear that while I am happy that somehow or other the meeting of the party leaders and the Leader of the House went off all right, my acceptance of the decision at this meeting does not mean that we are accepting the principle underlying the Bill."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I move—

' That the number of Members of the said Select Committee be more than fifteen.' "

MR. SPEAKER—" The question is—

' That the number of Members of the said Select Committee be more than fifteen.' "

The amendment was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall put the original motion as amended to vote. The question is—

' That the Madras Dramatic Performance Bill, 1954, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members :—

- 1 The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
- 2 The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
- 3 Sri K. Rajaram.
- 4 Sri C. Rajam Ramasami.
- 5 Sri M. D. Thyagaraja Pillai.
- 6 Sri K. Aranganathan.
- 7 Sri S. N. Somayajulu.
- 8 Sri Antony Peter.

8th December 1954] [Mr Speaker]

- 10 Sri K. Vinayakam.
- 9 Sri P. G. Manickam.
- 11 Sri V. Govindaswami Naidu.
- 12 Sri K. M. Seethi Sahib.
- 13 Sri S. Swayamprakasam.
- 14 Sri A. Veloo.
- 15 Sri S. S. Kolkebaile.
- 16 Sri M. Kalyanasundram.
- 17 Sri T. C. Narayanan Nambiar."

The motion was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I appoint the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam as Chairman of the Select Committee."

V.—GOVERNMENT MOTION.

MADRAS ASSEMBLY RULES AS APPROVED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I beg to present the 2-40
report of the Select Committee^a on the rules of procedure of the P. 104
Madras Legislative Assembly appointed in the year 1953 and
move—

' That the rules for regulating the procedure and conduct of business of the Madras Legislative Assembly under Article 208 (1) of the Constitution as formulated by the Select Committee be taken into consideration.'

I do not think any formal speech is necessary. I am sure hon. Members would have gone through the report and I think we can straightaway proceed with clause by clause consideration of the rules."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' That the rules for regulating the procedure and conduct of business of the Madras Legislative Assembly under Article 208 (1) of the Constitution as formulated by the Select Committee be taken into consideration.'

I have no objection to proceeding with the clause by clause consideration of the rules straightaway. But some hon. Members might be anxious to speak now."

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே ! அங்கத்தினர்கள் பலர் இதில் பொதுவாகப் பேச விரும்புகிறார்கள். நம்முடைய சபையின் நடவடிக்கைகள் ஆங்கிலத்திலே நடத்தப் படுக்கின்றன. தமிழ் மட்டும் தெரிந்த அங்கத்தினர்கள் தங்களுடைய கருத்தைச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறார்கள்.